Springer

De)queering Hatshepsut: Binary Bind in Archaeology of Egypt and Kingship Beyond the) Corporeal

Author(s): Uroš Matić

Source: *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, September 2016, Vol. 23, No. 3, "Binary Binds": Deconstructing Sex and Gender Dichotomies in Archaeological Practice (September 2016), pp. 810-831

Published by: Springer Nature

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43967042

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and .facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Springer Nature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*

JSTOR

This content downloaded from 97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

J Archaeol Method Theory (2016) 23:810–831
DOI 10.1007/s10816-016-9288-9

(De)queering Hatshepsut: Binary Bind in Archaeology of Egypt and Kingship Beyond the Corporeal

Uroš Matić[1]

Published online: 15 July 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Abstract The representations of Egyptian female king Hatshepsut are, as a consequence of a binary heteronormative sex/gender bind, continuously queered in scholarship. Statements on her body and identity are often made by directly equating her representations with the corporeal. This paper offers a critique of the heteronormative interpretations of Hatshepsut, which often identify her as a cross-dresser, gender-bender or "woman with a beard." An alternative approach will be attempted with the discussion of her imagery in the context of queer and Actor Network theoretical encounters. This paper argues that the binary bind of the sex/gender system can be traversed through a complex network of actants, including bodies, ancestors, relatives, gods, and material culture.

Keywords Hatshepsut · Sex/gender · Binary bind · Heteronormativity · Queer theory · Actor Network Theory

Introduction

In archaeology, the "binary bind" is a term that can refer to two different but seemingly related concepts. The first is an assumption regarding the existence of a binary (male–female) gender system in a certain society, which is often taken to be a fixed, natural, and normal division of bodies. Modern interpretations of what constitutes an appropriate male or female body are transferred onto past societies, at the same time excluding and silencing bodies considered to be *Other* both now and then. This is the case with many archaeological studies lacking gender awareness. The second concept derives from second-wave feminist criticism. It defines sex as the biological division of male

✉ Uroš Matić
urosmatic@uni-muenster.de

[1] Institut für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Münster, Germany

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and female bodies (differences in chromosomes, sex organs, hormones, and other physical features) and gender as the socio-cultural interpretation (*e.g.*, social role, status, identity) of these biological differences (Díaz-Andreu 2005: 14–15; Gilchrist 1999: 9; Rubin 1997; Sørensen 2000: 18). The fixity, naturality, and normality of a binary male–female gender system and the division of sex as biological and gender as cultural have been criticized in queer theory and argued to be products of heteronormativity (Butler 1990, 1993; Varela *et al.* 2011: 11–12; Gressgård 2011: 25). Anthropologists and archaeologists working with the premises of queer theory have shown that a binary male–female sex/gender system is not a cross-cultural fact and that the number of sexes/genders in different societies through time and space can vary (Díaz-Andreu 2005: 15–16; Hollimon 2000; Matić 2012a; Prine 2000). Some name this the multiple sex/gender paradigm, and its basic premise is not to assume the number of sexes/genders before analysis (Schmidt 2002: 160–162; Matić 2012a: 181–182). According to queer theoreticians, heteronormativity produces a male–female sex/gender division in order to naturalize heterosexuality and denaturalize other sexual identities. The fixity of male and female is proclaimed as natural since childbirth, with other genital sexes (*e.g.*, intersex individuals) being "fixed" to fit the predetermined sex/gender division (Butler 1990, 1993).

Gender is, according to Judith Butler, a performative practice that simultaneously proclaims and sustains a binary division of our bodies through the constant citation of previously established heteronorms (Butler 1990, 1993). Therefore, sex does not exist without social meanings, and the way in which we understand gender is essentially the way we understand sex because materiality is bound up with signification from the start (Butler 1993: 30). Bruno Latour warns that when a split is made between a material component (in our case sex) and an added social appendix (in our case gender), it is a certainty that this is an artificial division imposed by disciplinary measures and not by empirical requirement (Latour 2005: 83). However, one should be careful when working with Butler's theories when approaching nonwestern societies. Namely, a binary sex/gender system does not a priori imply the existence of sexual identities such as hetero-, homo-, bi-, lesbian, trans-, *etc.* Therefore, neither does it a priori imply the existence of homophobia or similar products of heteronormativity. Quite simply, sex/gender can be binary but still be conceptualized differently than in the West, without necessarily being produced by heteronormativity (Traub 2008: 3–8). Although we can argue that there was something that we would term a binary sex/gender system in ancient Egypt (grammatical gender and clear male–female binary in iconography), it does not follow that there were hetero-, homo-, or any other heteronormatively produced sexualities (cf. Büma and Fitzenreiter 2015: 19–20; Budka 2012: 111; Meskell 1999; Sweeney 2011). Same-sex acts were regarded differently than they would be by a western European heteronormative society: they were not essential to one's identity; they were not punished or legally regulated; and they were not the subject of medical and psychiatric examinations like in the West (cf. Foucault 1978). Categorization of sexual acts in Ancient Egypt was not based on sexual orientation or biological sex but on the role during the intercourse (Büma and Fitzenreiter 2015: 20). Indeed, if it can be said that such acts were considered not to be normative, this is true for the passive partner in intercourse. We are informed by this in the myth of the Contendings of Horus and Seth, where Seth does "a man's deed" to Horus and the Ennead (Nine Gods) spits before Horus, not knowing that he actually tricked Seth with

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the help of his mother Isis (Schukraft 2007: 308–313). Also, there are no state penalties in Ancient Egypt for same-sex intercourse (Müller-Wollermann 2004: 126), only some sources (The Instruction of Ptahhotep; Book of the Dead, Chapter 125) which indicate a negative view of sex with a passive partner in the body of a boy (Schukraft 2007: 325–328). Thus, what was considered negative is the appropriation of the passive role (cf. Müller-Wollermann 2004: 125) and not the same-sex act itself. This implies caution, as clearly a person's role during intercourse, that the person's choice of partner and the partner's age were being judged, and not the intercourse itself.

Current gender scholarship insists that there is no single gender experience, in the sense that there is no one "woman" or "man." These categories intersect with other facets of identity, such as social class, ethnicity, status, and occupation. The term *intersectionality* has become a buzzword in feminist theory during the last decade or so and refers to the intersection of gender with other categories of difference. Although few gender archaeologists explicitly employ the term, its basic premises have been integral to and ubiquitous in gender archaeology for the last two decades (Bolger 2013: 10–11). The idea that sex and gender intersect with other categories actually dates from the late nineteenth century, but the contemporary term focuses on the heterogeneity of individuals in different contexts (Fahlander 2012: 141). It was no different in ancient Egypt, as the position, occupation, status, ethnicity, *etc.*, of women and men differed and produced differently experienced intersections (Meskell 1999; Szpakowska 2012: 25; Sweeney 2011: 6). The interpretative problem that accompanies the use of the term intersectionality is the number of categories, which may reach infinity if we include every nuance of identity. Also, the question remains: does this term refer to individual experience and identity or to structural phenomena irreducible to individual experience (Graham 2014: 91–92)? Indeed, archaeology has learned the lessons of intersectionality, but in dealing with the past we may simply never be able to grasp the complexity of identities in a way comparable to cultural anthropologists.

Queer archaeology's objective is, among other things, to deconstruct heteronormative interpretations of the past. This has proved to be quite successful where some interpretations have been shown to be hetero-biased and quite problematic in their initial setting (Alberti 2005; Dowson 2000, 2009; Jensen 2007, 2009; Matić 2012a). It seems as a paradox that queer theory, which is usually referred to as more "inductive" than other sub-fields and approaches in archaeology, has shown that most of the archaeological research on gender employs this type of logic, including work which is often considered to be the most scientific and deductive such as osteoarchaeology, which is inductive to the bone (Geller 2008; Matić 2012a). But where do we go from here? Queer archaeology has been rightly criticized for limiting its aims to the deconstruction and criticism of heteronormativity, more often than not confining itself to the problems of sex, gender, and sexuality (for critique, see Jensen 2007, 2009). An additional problem is that traditionally queer theory has worked with texts and images (Butler 1990, 1993) and rarely on objects (Graham 2014; Jensen 2009). Finally, there is lack of overall queering/deconstruction in some archaeologies, be that territorially (*e.g.*, non-American, non-British, or non-Scandinavian archaeologies) or thematically (*e.g.*, the archaeology of Egypt). For example, the introduction of the ideas of queer theory and third-wave feminism to Egyptology (Meskell 1999) has, with the exception of some scholars familiar with these topics, not resulted in any major impetus for change within the field in general. Nevertheless, the potential of queer

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

theory for deconstructing heteronormative interpretations of the past must be acknowledged and indeed may form a starting point for addressing new questions (see also Moral, this volume). One possible way to give "queer potential" to images and texts, as common study material in queer theory, is to acknowledge their agency and view them as mutually related actors in a network including both human and nonhuman actants (*e.g.*, objects, gods, ancestors, *etc.*)

The aim of this paper is to explore the heteronormative binary binds in previous writing on Hatshepsut, female king of Egypt during the early 18th dynasty. This discussion will point to some erroneous receptions of this ruler by archaeologists and Egyptologists dealing with the concept of gender to varying degrees, as well as by scholars working in fields other than the archaeology of Egypt. Additionally, the potential to merge a queer approach with theories of the body and Actor Network Theory, which addresses nonhuman agency, will be explored in relation to depictions of Hatshepsut as a king within the ancient Egyptian cultural context.

Hatshepsut and the Early 18th Dynasty

In general chronological terms, the 18th dynasty (1550–1295 B.C.) dates to the Late Bronze Age, during which time Egypt had close contacts with the neighboring states of the eastern Mediterranean and the Near East. The history of the 18th dynasty starts with the defeat of the rival "Hyksos" kingdom in the north of Egypt (eastern Nile delta and Middle Egypt) under the first king of the 18th dynasty, Ahmose. He and his successors managed to extend the territory controlled by the 17th dynasty centered on Thebes (from which they originated), establish firm control, unify the land, and engage in military campaigns in Syria-Palestine and Nubia. It was during the 18th dynasty that Egypt reached the peak of its power and controlled its largest territory since the formation of its state. Hatshepsut organized expeditions to Punt, bringing frankincense and myrrh to Egypt, and commissioned many important building projects, including both the restoration of old structures—mostly temples—and the building of new ones.

The early 18th Dynasty is also known for its lack of male heirs produced by the royal couple. Thutmose I, third king of the 18th dynasty, had no surviving sons with his principal wife Ahmose; they had daughters named Hatshepsut and Nefrubity, the latter depicted with her parents in Deir el-Bahari. His son and heir Thutmose II was born by a secondary wife Mutnofret and probably became king after his father. Thutmose II married his half-sister Hatshepsut and reigned for only a few (roughly 3) years before his own death (Gabolde 1987: 67–68; Gabolde 2005: 149). Thutmose II and Hatshepsut also lacked a male heir, having instead a daughter named Neferure. The next king in line, Thutmose III, was born by a secondary wife of Thutmose II, named Isis (Большаков 2009: 142; Roth 2005: 11). Being that Thutmose III was very young at the time of his accession, it was necessary for a regent to take care of the actual governance. Indeed, although we do not know how young the new king was, he must have been very young, and Hatshepsut was as much as 20 to 25 years older. She is not mentioned in first orders issued by the king dated to the first 2 years of his reign, but the plans devised in these orders could not have been made by himself and were rather made in his name (Dorman 2006: 42–43). Hatshepsut thus governed the state from the very beginning. Before assuming the status of king, Hatshepsut first established herself

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

in the temple imagery through association with the official king in depictions of divine cult, sometimes with Thutmose III and at other times instead of him. Within this royal function, she associates herself with her deceased husband Thutmose II (Laboury 2014: 67).

Sometime during the end of the seventh regnal year and before the turn to the eighth year of Thutmose III, Queen Hatshepsut was herself crowned king (Gabolde 2005: 151; Lansing and Hayes 1937: 20). According to Ann Macy Roth, there are three groups she took as models in her legitimization of rule: kings' mothers, queen regents, and male kings (Roth 2005: 9). Of all the early 18th dynasty kings, it is likely that only Thutmose I came to the throne as an adult. Ahmose (first king of the 18th dynasty), Amenhotep I (second king of the 18th dynasty), and Thutmose II seem to have been quite young, perhaps even around 5 years old, at the times of their accessions. This means that women in the roles of kings' mothers or queen regents ruled Egypt for almost half of the 70 years before Hatshepsut (Большаков 2009: 15; Roth 2005: 11). This is a crucial fact to be considered if one intends to argue that the New Kingdom Egyptians found women running the state to be problematic.

However, it is the model of the male kings which is of interest for the problems addressed in this paper. The institution of kingship in ancient Egypt was a male institution, with the male king being identified as a male falcon-headed god Horus during his life and as the male god Osiris during his death. The king was also the son of god Re, being a god himself only insofar as there was no intermediate term between human and god. An Egyptian king maintained order by defeating chaos and was himself a manifestation of god on earth (Baines 1995: 9). The institution of queenship was complementary to the one of kingship, and the one could not exist without the other. The position of the queen was also rooted in mythology and the divine world, as the queens played important ritual roles (Robins 1993: 42). Hatshepsut is represented as a queen and god's wife bearing her standard royal titulary at Semna temple under two regnal years of Thutmose III on the exterior face of the west wall (Caminos 1998: Pl. 42). Hatshepsut later changed the scene by inverting the direction of the goddess Satet to face her and modified her arms so that she receives from her tools of kingship, as Thutmose III does from the god Dedwen in Semna. Indeed, thus Hatshepsut connected herself to the White crown of Upper Egypt worn by Satet (Shackell-Smith 2012: 137). At Buhen temple in Nubia, she is depicted as a queen (royal widow) worshiping her deceased husband Thutmose II with Thutmose III. This image of her was later changed to make it male (Caminos 1974: Pls. 74, 82). She was also represented as a woman, before her representation was changed into that of a king, on the reliefs around the niche of a statue, on a back wall of the chapel of Senenmut at Gebel es-Silsilah. Here she is depicted in the embrace of Sobek on the left and Nechbet on the right, both using feminine gender in their direct speech to her (Kucharekm 2010: 150–151). The early focus on Thutmose II reflects her source of legitimacy as queen regent and god's wife directing the state's affairs in the name of Thutmose III.

Later at Karnak, she was depicted as directly undertaking the divine right, being depicted on a block from the Chapelle Rouge (the Red Chapel) in female dress, although with a regal plumed crown with ram's horns and her cartouche with name Maatkare and title King of Upper and Lower Egypt (Chevrier 1934: Pl. IV). This points to the fact that adoption of the status of king did not entirely change her representations at the beginning but rather added to them royal regalia and a female royal name

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Maatkare. Thus, when she started her own sole rule she started it as a female pharaoh, depicted with her queenly gown and double-plumed headdress on top of her wig in performing the cult directly, a prerogative of kings. She is dressed as a woman and has female anatomy, but wears headdresses such as the *ibes* wig with a pair of tall feathers, which could be worn both by gods' wives and kings, or a *khat,* a plain variant of *nemes* headcloath, which could be worn by male and female members of the royal family, as well as some goddesses (Laboury 2014: 72). In a scene from the fragmented barque chapel of Tura limestone from Karnak, she is transformed from a queen in a vulture headdress to a ruler with crook, flail, and *nemes* headcloath (Gabolde 2005: 109–113, Pl. XXXVI).

Hatshepsut used different resources to achieve what Virginia Laporta has termed "ontological change." These resources included ritual celebrations, the erection of monuments, and the adoption of the royal attributes of the King (Laporta 2012: 121). That is why we find Hatshepsut represented as a male king both in relief and statuary when she took on both the role and traditional names of the king (man), however in female gender (Robins 1999: 103). We find her with the red skin color that is mostly found with men in Egyptian iconography and with muscular and explicitly masculine morphology, but also with a new face that appears to be a synthesis of her previous facial representation with thutmoside face characteristics (with sesostride elements)—thus relating her through an ideological discourse with Thutmose I, her father, and Thutmose II, her half-brother and husband (Laboury 2013: 15–16). Her final transformation of status meant fully adopting iconography of the king and his titles (names). It also meant abandoning expressions of legitimacy through her husband Thutmose II and the adoption of legitimacy through reference to Thutmose I her earthly father and Amun her divine father. She uses Wadjet-reneput as her *nebty* name, a name associated to patron goddesses of Upper and Lower Egypt, which is the feminine form of Wadj-reneput, an alternative Golden Horus name of Thutmose I found on his Karnak obelisk. Her first cartouche (an oval with a horizontal line enclosing the writing) name Maatkare can be associated to the one of Thutmose I, Aa-kheper-ka-re, and being that his Horus name was Meryt-maat, it is possible that this name is reflected in her choice of the name Maatkare (Robins 1999: 104–106). Her relation to Amun is expressed through the myth of her divine birth depicted and described in the temple of Deir el-Bahari.

(De)queering Hatshepsut

The representations of Hatshepsut that survive have made several authors wonder how she dressed in life. Suzanne Ratié argues that in order to fill the role of king, Hatshepsut both dressed as a man and was depicted as a man, which caused her psychological conflict. According to Ratié, by taking on male, kingly dress and regalia, she really became a king and changed personality (Ratié 1979: 316). The contemporary gender theory (sensu Butler) is exactly against such assumptions that simply dressing as another gender changes our gender. Gay Robins states that "we have no idea how she dressed in real life" and also claims that there was a "tension between Hatshepsut's biological sex and the male gender role of king" (Robins 1993: 51). Similarly, Ludwig D. Morenz and Lutz Popko refer to her as "an interesting case of gender-crossing in the context of a clash between biological body and what society requires to be in terms of

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

gender" (Morenz and Popko 2010: 110–111). This clearly indicates that a binary understanding of sex as biological fact and gender as social construct dominates gender reasoning in Egyptology. Arguing that there was a clash between nature and culture in the case of Hatshepsut could suggest a gender trouble, which privileges the modern tendency to regard the natural as more real than the social. Ancient Egyptian understanding could have been entirely different, and therefore, a priori drawing modern lines between nature and culture cannot be justified. Joyce Tyldesley points out that there is no evidence that Hatshepsut ever dressed as a man, concluding that there is no suggestion that she was either a lesbian or a transvestite (Tyldesley 1995: 223). One wonders why these terms, lesbian and transvestite, should be used at all, even if it were the case that Hatshepsut ever had to be dressed as a man. Such a statement implies, reading between the lines, that a woman dressing as a man is most probably a lesbian or transvestite. This is heteronormativity at its worst and has more to do with the peculiar understanding of modern, rather than ancient, identities.

One could argue that some of the views on Hatshepsut's identity are indeed heteronormative not because they reject the possibility of this ruler being different but because of the terminology used to describe her. Namely, lesbians and transvestites did not exist as identity categories in Ancient Egypt, and thus, we cannot refer to ancient genders with heavily laden terms that are the products of the "provincial European modernity" (Chakrabarty 2000; Foucault 1978; see also Moral, this volume, on "thirds"). With the application of these terms, we open the door to other projections and end up interpreting ancient Egyptian gendered lives as we would our own gendered lives. They become us. It is precisely by applying this binary sex/gender system with a heteronormative background that different authors, maybe unwillingly, have queered Hatshepsut. Barbara Watterson, on the contrary, claims that the fact that Hatshepsut is depicted with regalia of the king does not mean "that she thought of herself as a man" (Watterson 2012: 111). Dimitri Laboury also clearly states that even when depicted as a male king, there can be absolutely no doubt that she appeared during the inspection or the inauguration of these monuments as a female pharaoh (Laboury 2014: 49). Although his assumptions is most probably valid, we simply also do not have any direct evidence to confirm it. What we should question, rather, is what the sense of dressing as a man—rather than being represented as one—would be in order to fulfill the role of the king. Did Hatshepsut have to dress as a man at all in order to rule as a king? What would have been achieved by dressing as a man? Did dressing as a man change anything and could the same be achieved through other means? This paper, in line with a queer approach to Actor Network Theory, rather argues that more emphasis should be put on the agency of her representations as a king (man) than on the question of how she dressed.

Several scholars have argued that one interesting case of the contemporary social reception of Hatshepsut's kingship is perhaps attested to by a graffito from an unfinished Middle Kingdom tomb, located above Hatshepsut's mortuary temple at Deir el-Bahri. The graffito depicts a female person being penetrated by a male person from behind. The figures are either interpreted as Hatshepsut being penetrated by her court official Senenmut (Manniche 1977: 21–22; Romer 1982: 156–159), Hatshepsut being penetrated by a figure temptingly to be interpreted as Senenmut (Morenz 2014: 176), or Hatshepsut being penetrated by a random male (Wente 1984: 53). This graffito is often interpreted as a political parody (Morenz 2014: 176; Silverman 1995: 57; Silverman

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

2001: 128). Rather than writing about plausible ancient receptions of her kingship, these authors exposed presumptive biases about not only Hatshepsut and tolerance towards female rulers as already pointed out (Bryan 1996: 35) but also the sexual practices of ancient Egyptians. A survey of ancient Egyptian erotic scenes shows that sexual intercourse between a man and a woman in Egyptian iconography includes a sexual position in which a man would penetrate a woman from behind. We find such representations on ostraca, as graffiti, or on the famous Papyrus Turin 55001 (Janák and Navrátilova 2008: 65; Manniche 1987: 44–61). Additionally, Peter F. Dorman has shown how a romantic relationship between Hatshepsut and Senenmut is unfounded based on the available evidence (Dorman 1988: 18–65). Another problem is that we cannot be sure that the penetrated figure is Hatshepsut; however, we might interpret the other figure. The headdress of the female figure can be interpreted as a wig common to the women of the 18th dynasty and not just as the royal headdress without a *uraeus*, a cobra goddess and ornament serving as protection for the king (Bryan 1996: 34; Graves-Brown 2010: 150–151). Finally, as Christine Hue-Arcé has shown in her recent article on the graffiti from this tomb, the date of the hieratic (cursive writing system) inscription next to the graffiti cannot be used as an argument for the date of the depictions of the figures in sexual intercourse (Hue-Arcé 2013: 201).

The idea central to this interpretation—that the graffito is a parody—is also highly problematic. This depiction is interpreted as a parody only because of the assumption that there was a woman trying to fool everyone into believing that she was a man, rather than scholars considering the possibility that there was a woman who ruled as a king and expressed creativity in her representations as a ruler. Some Egyptologists indeed think that she was trying to convince her subjects, but the question of her gender was awkward (Wilkinson 2011: 231). This is directly contradicted by the very fact that even when depicted as a male, Hatshepsut still kept her names in female gender (Robins 1999). This was probably related to the preservation of her own identity behind such representations and to a presumed changed understanding of her body and gender. When she is addressed in male gender, we already find her fully adopting iconography of the king, and thus the use of the male gender in her name should not be interpreted as a personal wish but as a result of this change in status (Большаков 2009: 17). In short, the context of her biological body and the ritual context of kingship were overlapping (Laporta 2012: 120). Whether in her representations with a female body and king's regalia, or with a male body with king's regalia but named in female gender, Hatshepsut was not fooling anyone. She had been present at the royal court since the rule of Thutmose I when she was a young girl, and by the time Thutmose III ascended to the throne she would have been already more than 20. There can be no doubt that everyone at the court knew that she was a woman, and her titles before coronation indicate her strong role in temple rituals. Hatshepsut served as "God's wife of Amun," which may have even assured her the political support of the priesthood of Amun (Bryan 2000: 235; Roth 2005: 12). Thus, the priesthood would also have been very well informed, and being that court officials and priests had families and relatives who would have known her, it is ludicrous to think that her contemporaries indeed thought that she was a man. Additionally, the texts and images that we have of Hatshepsut were not accessible to the majority of the Egyptian population as they were intended for the gods, and one cannot lie to a deity (Gabolde 2014: 33)—an important critical factor for any Egyptologist to consider. The gender of Hatshepsut was transparent; the innovation was the use

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

of her male representations accompanied by texts referring to her in female gender (Dorman 2014: 5–6). There has never been an intention to conceal the fact that a woman was on the throne (Gabolde and Rondot 1996: 215).

Still, scholars from fields other than Egyptology do not hesitate to call Hatshepsut a cross-dresser, not explicitly stating if by this term they refer solely to her representations or they understand them as reflection of a change in reality of her embodiment in relation to gender (Arnold 2002: 251; Bullough and Bullough 1993: 24; Ramet 1996: 14). Similar terminology is used even in some most recent Egyptological works, namely, "gender-crossing," because of the depiction of Hatshepsut as a woman with a beard (Morenz 2014: 176), or more simply "gender-bending" (Dorman 2014: 5; Hartwig 2015: 203). The authors probably used this terminology to refer to a disjunction in her self-presentation; however, Egyptologists, as archaeologists, should be cautious when using such terms as they are historically contingent and bear a range of connotations. Cross-dressing is a practice not necessarily related to transgender identity, but it often carries this connotation. Stating that Hatshepsut was a cross-dresser or gender-bender could imply assumptions not only about her as a person but also about the society in which she lived. Such a statement implies a heteronormative society. Such assumptions are not based on available textual and archaeological evidence. Clearly, the idea of mocking a woman with a beard also reflects the heteronormative view on how male and female bodies are expected to look, now as well as then. Hormonal imbalance and hypertrichosis, which induce such appearance in some women, are, in certain circles, objects of mockery, but these circles have a specific historical setting. The Egyptian hieroglyphic seated bearded man determinative (A 40) is quite interestingly also found in the names of female divine entities, which can be explained by the fact that it at one point in time became a general divine classifier. We also find the seated woman determinative (B 1) written in male divine names. Additionally, the ordinary seated woman determinative as a counterpart to seated bearded man disqualified it as the female divine determinative, and that is why either a seated bearded man was used, or else a woman with a cobra on her forehead or wearing a flat crown and holding a lotus (B 7) (Shalomi-Hen 2008: 183–185). This warns us that we should not make a direct leap from images to the bodies of either gods/goddesses or (wo)men. It also casts doubt on the suggested comic effects of Hatshepsut depicted with a false beard of the king (sensu Morenz). The change in the use of determinatives in the case of Hatshepsut should thus also be viewed as being based on prototypical associations and her final decision to use the male prototype in her kingship iconography (David 2010: 30). Nowhere do we find Hatshepsut wearing a false beard and having female sexual characteristics at the same time (Grimm and Schoske 1999: 36). When her female characteristics such as breasts are emphasized in her statuary, she only wears a *nemes* head cloth traditionally worn by the Egyptian kings, and not a false beard (Tefnin 1979). The only flat image of Hatshepsut having full royal regalia including a false beard and, as Dimitri Laboury writes, "merely allusively feminine anatomy" (Laboury 2014: 50–51), is found in the first scene of the southern wall of the second room in the main sanctuary of her Temple of Millions of Year at Deir el-Bahari. Here we see her offering to Amun. One should also emphasize that there is evidence that this representation was initially a female representation of Hatshepsut with pinkish skin color, female anatomy, and royal regalia and

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

was later changed into a representation of Hatshepsut as the king by painting the pinkish color (somewhere between female yellow and male red) over with the red color associated with men (Laboury 2014: 78). One could therefore doubt the suggested "androgyny" if the false beard was added later; however, nothing indicates in this direction in the relief itself. This is coupled with another one to the other side of the door on the southern wall of this room, where Hatshepsut is depicted with a beard. Thus, androgyny was most surely not the primary goal of these changes but a transformation into a representation of a king. Usually, Hatshepsut is depicted either as female wearing royal regalia such as the *nemes* head cloth or *shendyt* garment or as male wearing all royal regalia including the false beard. Some authors argue that she is "represented in numerous statues wearing male clothing and a beard, occasionally even with a penis" (Arnold 2002: 251) without really providing an explanation as to why she appears in that way. When she is depicted with a penis, she is depicted as a child, and not as any child, but as a young male pharaoh being created by god Khnum (Naville 1897: Pl. XLVIII) or as a male child presented to the gods of Egypt. This is important to note because the divine birth of Hatshepsut was directly related to her cosmological role as a king. I am not aware of any representations of Hatshepsut, statuary or reliefs, where she is depicted as an adult with a penis.

Kasia Szpakowska rightfully states that representations of Hatshepsut with the royal regalia of male kings have nothing to do with cross-dressing. She offers a parallel with female barristers in the UK, who wear the same powdered wigs and robes as male barristers without cross-dressing or pretending to be male. They are wearing a distinctive garment associated with that specific office (Szpakowska 2012: 29). Some scholars have recently stopped seeing the integration of femininity in Hatshepsut's textual and visual representations as a gender problem (Bickel 2014: 27). It seems that the feminine identification of Hatshepsut was a vital part of her identity, which she was not leaving behind, but rather integrating it into kingship ideology. She was not particularly new and original in this, as the female king Neferusobek of the 12th dynasty also used the titles *female Horus* and *dauther of Re* and depicted herself with a mixture of female and male attributes (Laboury 2013: 20–21; Laboury 2014: 86–87; Sankiewitz 2011: 133). Neferusobek, like Hatshepsut, frequently refers to her father Amenemhat III. This suggests that Hatshepsut was aware of her predecessor's ideas and incorporated them in her own iconography and ideology of kingship (Laboury 2013: 20–21; Laboury 2014: 86–87; Sankiewitz 2011: 133). The connection with Neferusobek is also expressed in the choice of the first *cartouche* name of Hatshepsut (Maatkare), as the one of Neferusobek was Sobekkare. Being that it is possible that Hatshepsut and her advisors knew of her, they may have used her name as the model of Hatshepsut's (Robins 1999: 106). The connection with Neferusobek does not change if one reads the names of Hatshepsut and Neferusobek as Kamaatre and Kasobekre instead of the widespread reading of the names (cf. Graefe 2009: 314). It was also suggested that Hatshepsut could have had more than one attribute (male and female) without contradiction, being a consequence of a specific mode of thought, the "multiplicity of approaches" (Laporta 2012: 118). What maybe to us looks like a contradiction indeed does not need to be explained by cross-dressing. Similarly, the ramesside 19th dynasty female king Tawosret had her tomb (KV 14) closer in its architecture and decorative program to the tombs of kings than to the tombs of queens. Some of the male deities depicted in the tomb had epithets written in female grammatical gender. Her tomb was

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

essentially a modified king's tomb, with scenes used in ramesside queen's tombs and vignettes appropriate for king's tombs employed together with new feminized versions of kingly scenes (McCarthy 2008: 84–85). Although Hatshepsut is not the only Egyptian queen who used male motifs in her iconography, she is best known for this to non-Egyptologists. Indeed, Neferusobek and Tawosret did not go so far as Hatshepsut in adopting male ruler's iconography. Neferusobek reigned as a female ruler only after her brother's, Amenemhat IV's, death. Tawosret did have the role of the first regent of Siptah, heir of Seti II; however, she took the role of the female ruler only after his death, not during his lifetime as Hatshepsut did. Maybe this is the reason why Neferusobek and Tawosret never fully adopted the iconography of a king; they, unlike Hatshepsut, did not rule beside a younger, legitimate but under-aged king (cf. Robins 1993: 50).

Some authors use Hatshepsut's representations as an argument for the existence of "ambiguity, multiple genders, plurality and difference" during the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean (Hitchcook 2000: 79). As an example from Egypt, Louise Hitchcook refers directly to Hatshepsut and, although she correctly lists all of her representations as a male king with or without feminine elements, she emphasizes their ambiguity. There was, however, as I have argued above, nothing ambiguous about the sex/gender of Hatshepsut. Some have even suggested that we are dealing here with a "gender transformer" as a consequence of "honorary male syndrome," where a female individual is gendered male (Arnold 2002: 251). The "gender transformer" premise does not account for the argument that it was not Hatshepsut as an individual who was gendered male, but rather her representations in particular contexts which were changed and which, after being changed in certain contexts where her personality had to remain an active actant of a complex network of kingship and cult, still preserved her femininity.

It can be concluded that scholars tend to interpret the gender of Hatshepsut and her dress in life on the basis of her representations, using one set of data to interpret practices for which we do not have any attestations. In this process, they have inscribed contemporary heteronormative views of sex/gender in their interpretations and have bound themselves in the binary system of their own time, using certain modern terms such as cross-dressing or gender bending with little criticism. These terms and related identities have interpretative potential only within the modern western gender system which produced them. Their interpretative potential in Egyptian society is questionable even though this society also seems to have had a binary gender system (Sweeney 2011: 1–2). Therefore, we need to consider that different binary gender systems can exist, not necessarily functioning in a heteronormative way and allowing completely different gender identities, and practices to exist (cf. Budka 2012: 111–113). Additionally, we can assume that these different gender binaries, identities, and practices were also socially regulated through discourses and representations.

John Baines has shown that the Egyptian representations were ordered by decorum, "a set of rules and practices, defining what may be represented, pictorially with captions, displayed and possibly written down, in which context and in what form [...] and was probably based ultimately on rules and practices of conduct and etiquette, of spatial separation and religious avoidance" (Baines 1990: 20). On that note, we should return to representations not as direct reflections of reality, but as its frames (sensu Butler). We should never forget that when we deal with representations of

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Hatshepsut, we do not deal with her corporeal aspects; she does not stand before us and we are not observing her. We are observing what she wanted us to see, that which she wanted to achieve. These particular goals could be achieved by innovations and subtle changes in decorum but were nevertheless set in its general frames (cf. McCarthy 2008).

Achieving Kingship beyond the Corporeal

Instead of arguing that representations reflect what Hatshepsut really looked like, whether she dressed as one should not be dressed or if she looked as one should not have looked when being of a certain sex/gender, it is far more theoretically productive to propose that the representations reflect what she could not have but still needed to look like in order to fulfill certain roles. Bo Jensen, clearly influenced by the work of Joanna Sofaer (2006), suggests that "we need to move from the body-that-is not to bodies-that-are" (Jensen 2009: 53). However, as much as this view summarizes the necessity of concentrating on the corporeal aspects of the body rather than its constructiveness, I would like to propose exploring the process of "bodies-that-are" by turning towards "bodies-that-are-not." It should be stressed immediately that no premise of a true and false body is intended here. We need to accept the possibility of human bodies encompassing more than just the corporeal (our flesh and bone). Objects we are not born with could easily become part of our bodies, creating hybrid bodies with both corporeal elements and material culture elements. We are surrounded by these bodies, be they people using wheelchairs, prostheses, or plastic corrective or esthetic surgery or people dyeing their hair or polishing their nails, tattooing, piercing, *etc.* Even without these noticeable corporeal modifications, we all change our bodies with items of material culture; these include our computers, smartphones, *etc.*, that form our extended selves (sensu Gell 1998). We as modern, Western people are not alone in having hybrid bodies, and we are often not aware of the creative process behind such hybridizations. Indeed, perhaps we fail to see this in other societies because it is we who have sharply separated nature from culture, producing a vast number of hybrids in the process but failing to recognize them. Bruno Latour calls this the "paradox of the moderns" and insists that the more we forbid ourselves to think of hybrids, the more possible their interbreeding becomes. Indeed, for Latour, we have never been modern in the sense that "translation" (a term he uses for a set of practices which create mixtures or hybrids of nature and culture) and "purification" (a term he uses for the creation of two entirely distinct ontological zones of human and nonhuman) were in operation prior to modernity, only the moderns deny it or simply do not recognize it (Latour 1993: 10–12). Actor Network Theory (ANT) insists that the social does not exist as glue bringing people and things together. There is no social realm distinguishable from nature, people, and things (Latour 1993: 13; Latour 2005: 5–8). The social is reassembled through a network of actants. It is a social theory which follows the natives no matter which "metaphysical imbroglios" they lead us into. It follows the actors in their weaving through things they have added to social skills without excluding nonhuman actors. This does not mean simply to consider that objects do things instead of humans, but to explore the collective of entities assembling the social (Latour 2005). Thus, when we find Hatshepsut depicted as a woman with royal regalia or as a king with or without

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

names in feminine form, we should not first think about how this changed herself (gender identity), but if and how this change in her representations was related to other actors (ancestors, contemporaries, and gods) of a network.

The idea of material nonhuman agency, existing in ANT, was introduced to archaeology primarily through Alfred Gell's cultural anthropological theory of art and agency. He approaches art as a "system of action, intended to change the world, rather than encode symbolic propositions about it" (Gell 1998: 6). This idea was welcomed by art historians and archaeologists who wanted to go further than the interpretative approach concentrating on meaning, without neglecting the meanings in the process. The so-called art nexus describing different agent/patient relationships and the concept of distributed agency have also been applied in various cases in the archaeology of Egypt (Matić 2012b, 2014; Kjølby 2009; Price 2011: 410). Magical capacity of visual culture in Ancient Egypt has also been intensively studied (Eschweiler 1994), but not in relation to the "art nexus." However, the corporeal–material body hybrids of ANT are often left unexplored in archaeology, particularly in the archaeology of Egypt where material agency is often used in discussing art objects. Only a few authors discuss how material culture is a crucial substitute for what is sometimes corporeally missing but yet essential to existence (Joyce and Meskell 2003; Meskell 2004), *e.g.*, the adoption of masculine traits (masculinized or androgynous coffin; male *ushabti* figurines; the use of male pronouns) by female individuals in burials of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period in order to ensure afterlife (cf. Bryan 1996: 35; Cooney 2008: 6–16). Interestingly, the same arguments were not applied to the case of Hatshepsut although her case could have been used to illustrate the basic premises of the agency of representations and what they can achieve for the one who is represented. The potential of ANT for gender archaeology has only recently been discovered. Fredrik Fahlander quite nicely summarizes how various identities including gender are not ideology added to biology, but are rather constituted by discourse, norms, culture in intersection with bodies, and material culture, without any of these being given predominance. The body is thus just one of the actants in a network (Fahlander 2012: 141–142). The full interpretative potential of ANT is still to be explored in the context of Egyptian gender.

ANT has not been equally received by different authors primarily dealing with queer theory. Some welcome it because it provides an opportunity for the study of the agency of nonhuman entities by allowing artifacts to "directly enable specific ways of being" (Jensen 2009: 43; cf. Wadiwel 2009: 493–497). There are also those authors who, still nurturing the (post)structuralist legacy, cannot accept "matter before the sign" (Graham 2014: 33). However, as identities are material, and as queer theory insists on the fact that they are never a finished process but rather a work in progress, the potential of material culture/nonhuman agency studies through a queer perspective is undeniable. This is because agency does not reside in the human or nonhuman bodies or objects, but is rather a contact between them (Ahmed 2006: 188). One could say that although references to ANT and nonhuman agency in queer literature are existent, they are rather sporadic. The full potential of this theoretical encounter has been explored by Bo Jensen in his discussion of the materiality of different queer identities, including leather-daddies, bears, and skins (Jensen 2009). Queer intervention insists that signification, imagination, fantasy, and unpredictability of embodiments may open up space beyond heteronormative restrictions (Varela *et al.* 2011: 13). It is exactly for this reason queer theory must include material culture as an actant in the process of embodiment.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

However, we should not use what we often term "theory" in archaeology as a bumper sticker. If we can at all argue that material culture can stand in for what we do not have or for how we do not look and can indeed have an effect, then we have to contextualize it within the society in question. Therefore, was the body limited to the corporeal in Ancient Egypt? The answer is that our humanistic idea of the body is simply not attested in the sources. Both people and the gods could embody the corporeal and the material having their *ka* or *ba* soul living in their images (Kjølby 2009: 37–41; Meskell 2004: 98–99; Robins 2005: 1–2). Thus, the corporeal could be transcended through the material, and the statues can, as projections of earthly desires serving as the body and materialization of a person, assume their own agency and power (Kjølby 2009: 38; Meskell 2004: 88). The statues of Egyptian kings appeared in royal funerary complexes and temples, and their presence there allowed the kings to be there in essence and granted them access to the gods (Robins 2001: 35). The case was the same with private temple statues that distributed the person of their owner, granting him proximity to the king and gods (Kjølby 2009: 36–41) without his corporeal presence. Indeed, as we know that temple access was restricted for those other than gods, kings, and priests (Baines 1995: 12–13), then material culture could serve to overcome this. Most of the survived statues of Hatshepsut come from such cultic contexts.

The representations of Hatshepsut can be divided into flat images on stelas or temple reliefs and statues. They depict her as a woman; as a woman with regalia of male kings; as a male sphinx (sometimes with female elements); and as a king (Keller 2006: 158–160; Ratié 1979: 124–132; Tefnin 1979). The so-called pillars of Hatshepsut in the "form of Osiris" should be rather related to her representation as a king in the context of the Sed festival and not as god Osiris, confirmed also by the text referring to the Sed festival on some of them (Leblanc 1980: 81–82). The changes in her representations, either by adding only royal regalia or finally by depicting her as a king, started only after her coronation (Большаков 2009: 16; Keller 2006: 159). When the feminine aspects of her body are depicted, she is not wearing the so-called false beard of the pharaohs as already mentioned. However, although the female identity of Hatshepsut was kept in her name, it is her corporeal aspects of femininity which gradually disappear from her representations in making a more unequivocal statement of exclusively royal kind (Tefnin 1979; Laboury 2014). That is to say, one aspect of her identity was her femininity. If the representations of a king were supposed to depict her, in those contexts where her person was represented as active in cult, then they needed to have at least one common element, also to make the agency of these representations possible. Referring to her as to a female in such contexts suggests that her female identity was retained (Большаков 2009: 18; Robins 1999), which is quite important for the effect that these representations had to achieve. When her representations turned entirely male, it was her name written in female gender which continued to connect her to them. With the adoption of royal insignia on a female body, Hatshepsut's face in her representation also changed, from the one inspired by Senwosret I (1956–1911 B.C.) to the individual one that might be inspired by her actual appearance. When, however, she fully adopted male iconography, her face again changed to more closely resemble one of her predecessors, retaining only some individual elements (Laboury 2014: 80–82). The introduction of other human actors (predecessors) first and foremost by an iconographic reference to them should be viewed as equally important for the agency of

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

these representations as are the royal regalia which she adopts here. This can also be observed in her representation in the form of a sphinx with lion's mane which is before her for the first time attested under Amenemhat III, father of Neferusobek (Schulz 2015: 13). Being that Hatshepsut established iconography of kingship on a model partly inspired by the iconography and names of Neferusobek, it is possible that her choice of this type of the sphinx was also not accidental. This type of sphinx can be understood as a manifestation of the Sun god (cf. Verbovsek 2006: 106–107). However, the difference is that the ones of Hatshepsut are representations of her as daughter of Amun-Re (Schulz 2015: 14).

That the binary bind of the ancient Egyptian gender system (Sweeney 2011) cannot be avoided so easily and that images, as actants, could serve to resolve this issue are supported by the very fact that whenever Hatshepsut as a king acts as a ritual subject together with Thutmose III, she is shown in front of him assuming the higher iconographic status (Robins 1994: 34–40) and priority in proximity to the gods. This is evident in the scene from the *Chapelle Rouge* (Red Chapel) constructed in Karnak as a barque shrine during the reign of Hatshepsut (Burgos and et Larché 2006; Lacau and Chevrier 1979). In the scene of the *Chapelle Rouge* where she is not depicted in front of Thutmose III, as in the case of the two of them on a barque depicted opposite to each other, he is the one depicted rowing and she is the one depicted passively on the right side of the scene (Burgos and et Larché 2006: 60, 113; Lacau and Chevrier 1979: Pl. 9). Bearing in mind that passivity in Egyptian decorum is a mark of higher status vis-a-vis the other figures and the dominance of the right side (Robins 1994: 33–34), here again is Hatshepsut depicted as a prominent figure. Were she to be depicted as a woman, the presence of Thutmose III in such scenes could affect her status because he was a de facto male (cf. Laporta 2012: 121), and iconographically speaking, he would be expected to be depicted in front of her. Only by depicting herself as a king (man) could Hatshepsut take on the leading position in the scenes she appears in with Thutmose III as an actant and thus be a primary actant herself, both in decorum and in reality. Indeed, in the scenes of *Chapelle Rouge*, Hatshepsut is never depicted behind Thutmose III and his immediate proximity to the gods is only in those scenes when he is depicted as sole ritual subject (Burgos and et Larché 2006; Lacau and Chevrier 1979). Statistically, Hatshepsut is to be found significantly more often in cult scenes of the *Chapelle Rouge* than is Thutmose III (Stephan 2008: 114). As I have also pointed out above, Thutmose III is always behind Hatshepsut. He also never wears the White crown of Upper Egypt or the Double crown (Stephan 2008: 115). The same can be observed in the temple of Deir el-Bahari. Hatshepsut is in front of Thutmose III on the eastern wall of the second chamber of the shrine of Anubis (Naville 1897: XLV), on the southern niche of the entrance hall of the shrine of Hathor (Naville 1901: XCIX), and on the top of the north wall of the old sanctuary (Naville 1906: CXLIII). Statistically, she is depicted or referred to much more frequently than Thutmose III (four times more often in temple decoration), and when they are depicted together she is in front of him (Laboury 2014: 52).

Clearly, the agency of these representations was crucial for Hatshepsut and was achieved by adoption of representation in the form of the king (man) which was the only way she could have herself represented as the primary figure in such scenes. Her primacy is also expressed through the fact that during her reign, it is not Thutmose III but Hatshepsut who is depicted as a king (man) in one of the cosmologically most

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

important motifs of ancient Egyptian decorum, trampling the enemies in the form of a male sphinx (Naville 1908: Pl. CLX) or smiting them (Pawlicki 1997: 50). Being that queens are never depicted smiting male enemies but female ones instead (like queens Tiye and Nefertiti who smite female enemies), it is only by being represented as a king that Hatshepsut could be smiting male enemies (Matić forthcoming).

She also needed to retain her feminine identity in contexts where she is active in a cult by depicting either a female body wearing royal regalia or a male kingly body addressed in female gender in text. Depicting Hatshepsut as a woman together with Thutmose III would cause iconographic hierarchy in which Hatshepsut as woman would be in second place (Robins 1994: 37–40). The use of feminine and masculine forms of her name in the *Chapel Rouge* shows that when she is represented as a *person*, meaning as active in cult actions and being addressed by the gods, she is always addressed in female form, whereas in other cases both forms are attested (cf. David 2010: 31–32; Stephan 2008: 120). This indicates that aspects of her identity were important to be preserved for these significant cultic representations to have their agency.

The complexity of Hatshepsut's network of kingship is also expressed in the role of human and divine actors. Hatshepsut as a king did not have a principal wife, one more argument against any doubts about her gender or sexual identity, but she needed a female relative to serve as priestess mediating in the transformation and regeneration of Amun. Being that her daughter Neferure was already "God's wife of Amun" before she crowned herself as a king, she was the obvious choice (Bolshakov 2014: 253). It is her daughter Neferure who fulfilled the role of the "God's wife of Amun" in scenes of Hatshepsut and who is depicted in Deir el-Bahari Upper Courtyard performing rituals in the feminine role in relation to king Hatshepsut and the god Amun (Robins 1993: 49; Pawlicki 2007: 113). Indeed, it has also been suggested that Hatshepsut intended to see her daughter as the next king (Bolshakov 2014: 250–264; Forbes 1994–1995: 41–42; Szafrański 2007: 149–150). This should not be understood as some kind of ancient feminist movement, but as a continuation of a line of rulers to which Hatshepsut was related to (starting with her father Thutmose I) and the fact that Hatshepsut did not have a male heir. Therefore, the gender of Hatshepsut is not simply a contextual placement of her bodily characteristics in the new role of the king. It is a complex network of actants, from the corporeal aspect of her female body that affected the need for the new ways of expression, in order to comply to already established rules of composition and decorum, to the ancestors she refers to or uses as models in creating her kingly identity (most probably starting from reference to Neferusobek in the construction of her name, to Thutmose I as her father and possibly Amenemhat III as Neferusobek's daughter), the living relatives that she uses for the same purpose (Neferure), and the god Amun as her divine father. It was therefore enough for Hatshepsut to be depicted as a king and not to be dressed as one. Being a king was, in her case, achieved by transcending the corporeal bind through a complex network of bodies (Neferure), ancestors (Neferusobek, Thutmose I), relatives (Neferure, Thutmose I), gods (Amun), and images. Indeed, in this regard, she does not differ from other Egyptian rulers as everything suggests that there was no gender trouble behind her representations as she creatively complied to decorum, achieving kingship beyond the corporeal.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Conclusion

This paper tries to demonstrate that the binary bind of the modern heteronormative matrix not only produces heteronormative interpretations but also impedes scholars' efforts to research their material in context. The question which the session "Binary bind: deconstructing sex and gender dichotomies in archaeological practice" at the 20th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists in Istanbul (2014) posed about the presence or absence of binary bind(s) in ancient societies can also be re-formulated further. Does a potential binary bind in a past society operate in the same way as in what we term modern society? Does the fact that there was a binary gender system in Ancient Egypt mean that it operated like the one we are aware of today? My inclination would be to answer these questions negatively, as the binary bind of modern society has its roots in the heteronormative matrix that we indeed do not recognize in Ancient Egypt. Heterosexuality and heteronormativity are particular configurations of desire, subjectivity, emotional affect, and marital structure, which cannot be understood as universal. Therefore, not only would we be wrong to use certain terminologies stemming from that matrix, but we can also easily misunderstand some phenomena which do seem similar at first glance. This is because "as sexual categories and epistemologies travel across borders, all efforts at cross-cultural translation and comparison are imbued with politically loaded significations of tradition and modernity" (Traub 2008: 9).

By concentrating on how one uses material culture to go beyond his or her corporeality, a whole new research potential for gender theory and queer archaeology opens up. Queer theory should be taken out of the archive and into the physical world (Jensen 2009: 50) if it intends to deconstruct sex/gender, nature/culture, body/mind, and similar dichotomies. The example of Hatshepsut proves this quite well, considering that we cannot understand her without the material culture that is her representations.

The decision to change her female representations into those of a male body with the regalia of kings, and to start a series of new representations of the same character with her name and titles remaining feminized, indicates that for some reason, Hatshepsut concluded that it was better to comply with established rules of decorum. Indeed, maybe she did not have a choice, bearing in mind the confines of Egyptian art and her situation (corporeality). As the role of these representations was primarily cultic in nature, meaning that they were supposed to achieve a close relationship between the king and the gods, it could be argued that female representations with kingly regalia were not regarded to be as effective as the ones where she is depicted with a male body. In order to solve this, much creativity was needed along with a complex network of human and material culture actants. Hatshepsut's representations with a female body and royal regalia were also not numerous and probably prompted confusion in a network of men, women, gods, goddesses, temples, reliefs, statues, *etc.* The representations of Thutmose III are absent from the scenes where she is depicted as a woman with royal regalia, as this would mean that she would have to be positioned behind him or take an inferior iconographic position in relation to his representation, regardless of the status afforded by her regalia. Representations of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were introduced again only after she fully adopted male iconography but kept her names and titles with female endings (Laboury 2014: 88–89). Keeping her names written in the female gender on these representations maintained their relationship to her body and

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

personality. These representations allowed Hatshepsut to achieve kingship beyond the corporeal. The introduction of Thutmose III into the corpus of her representations did not endanger her status as a female, as she transcended the binary bind through a complex network that formed her gender in her representations, thus allowing her to take the role of the prominent figure in scenes when they occur together.

Acknowledgments I would like to thank the editors for inviting me to contribute to the session "Binary bind: deconstructing sex and gender dichotomies in archaeological practice" at the 20th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists in Istanbul (2014) and for their comments on the paper. My acknowledgments also go to my supervisor Angelika Lohwasser for reading the draft of the paper and to the anonymous reviewers whose comments provided sound criticism and useful suggestions, which enhanced the quality of the paper. I also thank Simon Dix and the editors (Lara Ghisleni, Alexis Jordan, Emily Fioccoprile) for English correction. Last but not the least, I would like to thank Delta Foundation (Serbia) for their grant (2012–2016).

References

Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology. Orientations, objects, others*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Alberti, B. (2005). Bodies in prehistory: beyond the sex/gender split. In P. P. A. Funari, A. Zarankin, & E. Stovel (Eds.), *Global archaeological theory: contextual voices and contemporary thoughts* (pp. 107–120). London: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Arnold, B. (2002). "Seind und Werden": gender as a process in mortuary ritual. In S. M. Nelson & M. Rosen-Ayalon (Eds.), *In pursuit of gender: worldwide archaeological approaches* (pp. 239–256). Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

Baines, J. (1990). Restricted knowledge, hierarchy, and decorum: modern perceptions and ancient institutions. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt, XXVII*, 1–23.

Baines, J. (1995). Kingship, definition of culture, and legitimation. In D. O'Connor & D. P. Silverman (Eds.), *Ancient Egyptian kingship. Probleme der Ägyptologie IX* (pp. 3–48). Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Bickel, S. (2014). Worldview and royal discourse in the time of Hatshepsut. In J. M. Galán, B. M. Bryan, & P. F. Dorman (Eds.), *Creativity and innovation in the reign of Hatshepsut, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 69* (pp. 21–32). Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Bolger, D. (2013). Introduction: gender prehistory-the story so far. In D. Bolger (Ed.), *A companion to gender prehistory* (pp. 1–20). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bolshakov, V. A. (2014). The King's Daughter Neferura: Eventual Heiress of Hatshepsut? Chronique d'Égypte LXXXIV. Fasc. *178*, 248–268.

Bryan, B. (1996). In women good and bad fortune are on earth. Status and roles of women in Egyptian culture. In A. K. Capel & G. E. Markoe (Eds.), *Mistress of the house-mistress of heaven, Women in Ancient Egypt* (pp. 25–46). New York: Hudson Hills Press.

Bryan, B. (2000). The 18th dynasty before the Amarna period (c. 1550-1352 BC). In I. Shaw (Ed.), *The Oxford history of ancient Egypt* (pp. 207–264). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Budka, J. (2012). Zur Notwendigkeit einer kritischen Archäologie—einige Bemerkungen aus ägyptologischer Perspektive. *Forum kritische Archäologie, 1*, 110–115.

Bullough, V. L., & Bullough, B. (1993). *Cross dressing, sex and gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Büma, B., & Fitzenreiter, M. (2015). 'Spielt das Lied der beiden göttlichen Brüder': Erotische Ambiguität und 'große Nähe' zwischen Männern im Alten Reich. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, 44*, 19–42.

Burgos, F. et Larché, F. (2006). *La Chapelle Rouge: le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout*. Volume I. Fac-similés et photographies des scènes. Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble. In *Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter, On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. London and New York: Routledge.

Caminos, R. (1974). *The New Kingdom Temples at Buhen*. Vol. 2. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Egypt 34. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Caminos, R. (1998). *Semna-Kumma I.* The Temple of Semna. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Egypt 37. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought and historical difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chevrier, H. (1934). Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1933–1934) (avec 4 planches). *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, XXXIV,* 159–176.

Cooney, K. M. (2008). The problem of female rebirth in New Kingdom Egypt: the fragmentation of the female individual in her funerary equipment. In C. Graves-Brown (Ed.), *Sex and gender in ancient Egypt. 'Don your wig for a joyful hour'* (pp. 1–26). Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

David, A. (2010). Hathshepsut and the image of kingship: ink bik. *Göttinger Miszellen, 244,* 27–33.

Díaz-Andreu, M. (2005). Gender identity. In M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babić, & D. N. Edwards (Eds.), *The archaeology of identity: approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion* (pp. 13–42). London: Routledge.

Dorman, P. F. (1988). *The monuments of Senenmut. Problems in historical methodology.* London and New York: Kegan Paul International.

Dorman, P. F. (2006). The early reign of Thutmose III: an unorthodox mantle of Coregency. In E. H. Cline & D. O'Connor (Eds.), *Thutmose III. A new biography* (pp. 39–68). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Dorman, P. F. (2014). Innovation at the dawn of the New Kingdom. In J. M. Galán, B. M. Bryan, & P. F. Dorman (Eds.), *Creativity and innovation in the reign of Hatshepsut, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 69* (pp. 1–6). Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Dowson, T. A. (2000). Why queer archaeology? An introduction. World Archaeology. *Queer Archaeologies, 32*(2), 161–165.

Dowson, T. A. (2009). Queer theory meets archaeology: disrupting epistemological privilege and heteronormativity in constructing past. In N. Giffney & M. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to queer theory* (pp. 277–294). Surrey: Ashgate.

Eschweiler, P. (1994). Bildzauber im alten Ägypten, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 137. Freiburg Schweiz und Göttinge: Universitätsverlag und Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Fahlander, F. (2012). Facing gender. Corporeality, materiality, intersectionality and resurrection. In I-M. B. Danielsson & S. Thedéen (Eds.), *To tender gender.* The pasts and futures of gender research in archaeology. Stockholm Studies in Archaeology 58 (pp. 13e7–152). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Forbes, D. C. (1994-1995). Princess Neferure. Hatshepsut's intended successor? KMT. *A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt, 5*(4), 36–43.

Foucault, M. (1978). The History of sexuality. Volume I: an introduction. In *Translated from French by Robert Hurley.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Gabolde, L. (1987). La chronologie du règne de Thoutmosis II, ses conséquences sur la datation des momies royales et leurs répercutions sur l'histoire du développement de la Vallée des Rois. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, 14,* 61–81.

Gabolde, L. (2005). Monuments décorés en bas relief aux noms de Thoutmosis II et Hatchepsout à Karnak. Mémoires publiés par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire 123. Le Caire: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.

Gabolde, L. (2014). Hatshepsut at Karnak: a woman under God's commands. In J. M. Galán, B. M. Bryan, & P. F. Dorman (Eds.), *Creativity and innovation in the reign of Hatshepsut, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 69* (pp. 33–48). Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Gabolde, L. & Rondot, V. (1996). Une chapelle d'Hatchepsout remployée à Karnak-Nord Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. *96,* 177–227.

Gell, A. (1998). *Art and agency, An anthropological theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geller, P. L. (2008). Conceiving sex: fomenting a feminist bioarchaeology. *Journal of Social Archaeology, 8,* 113–138.

Gilchrist, R. (1999). *Gender and archaeology: contesting the past.* London and New York: Routledge.

Graefe, E. (2009). kA mAat raw "Ursprung der Maat ist Re". In W. Claes, H. de Meulenaere, & S. Hendrickx (Eds.), *Elkab and beyond, Studies in Honour of Luc Limme* (pp. 313–319). Leuven and Paris: Uitgeverij Peeters.

Graham, M. (2014). *Anthropological explorations in queer theory.* Surrey: Ashgate.

Graves-Brown, C. (2010). *Dancing for Hathor: women in ancient Egypt.* London: Continuum.

Gressgård, R. (2011). Revisiting contigency, hegemony and universality. In A. Engel, M. M. C. Varela, & N. Dhawan (Eds.), *Hegemony and heteronormativity: revisiting 'the political' in queer politics* (pp. 25–42). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Grimm, A. & Schoske, S. (1999). Hatschepsut. KönigIN Ägyptens. München: Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst.

Hartwig, M. K. (2015). Sculpture. In M. K. Hartwig (Ed.), *A companion to ancient Egyptian art* (pp. 191–218). Oxford: Willey-Blackwell.

Hitchcook, L. (2000). Engendering ambiguity in Minoan Crete: It's a drag to be a king. In M. Donald & L. Hurcombe (Eds.), *Representations of gender from prehistory to the present* (pp. 69–86). London: Macmillan.

Hollimon, S. E. (2000). Archaeology of the 'Aqi: gender and sexuality in prehistoric Chumash society. In B. L. Voss & R. A. Schmidt (Eds.), *Archaeologies of sexuality* (pp. 179–196). London & New York: Routledge.

Huc-Arcé, C. (2013). Les graffiti érotiques de la tombe 504 de Deir el-Bahari revisités. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 113*, 193–202.

Janák, J., & Navrátilova, H. (2008). People vs. P. Turin 55001. In C. Graves-Brown (Ed.), *Sex and gender in ancient Egypt. 'Don your wig for a joyful hour'* (pp. 63–71). Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Jensen, B. (2007). Queer Bedfellows: Gender Ambiguity, Shamans, Hijras, 'Berdache' and the Problems of Using Ethnographic Record. In P. Jensen, S. Sindbæk & H. Vandkilde (Eds.), *XI Nordic TAG, Århus 10–12 May 2007, Globalization, identity, material culture and archaeology* (pp. 25–32). Århus: Institute of Anthropology, Archaeology and Linguistics, Aarhus Universitet.

Jensen, B. (2009). Rude tools and material difference-queer theory, ANT and materiality: an under-explored intersection? *Graduate Journal of Social Science, 6*(1), 42–71.

Joyce, R. A. & L. M. Meskell. (2003). *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Egyptian Experience*. London and New York: Routledge.

Keller, C. A. (2006). The statuary of Hatshepsut. In C. H. Roehrig (Ed.), *Hatshepsut from queen to pharaoh* (pp. 158–173). New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Kjølby, A. (2009). Material agency, attribution and experience of Agency in Ancient Egypt. The case of new kingdom private temple statues. In R. Nyord & A. Kjølby (Eds.), *'Being in ancient Egypt'. Thoughts on agency, materiality and cognition. Proceedings of the seminar held in Copenhagen, September 29–30, 2006* (pp. 31–46). Oxford: Archaeopress.

Kucharekm A. (2010). Senenmut in Gebel es-Silsilah. Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo *66*, 143–160.

Laboury, D. (2013). Citations et usage de l'art du Moyen Empire à l'époque thoutmoside. In S. Bickel (Ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft, Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22* (pp. 11–28). Basel: Schwabe Verlag.

Laboury, D. (2014). How and why did Hatshepsut invent the image of her Royal Power? In J. M. Galán, B. M. Bryan, & P. F. Dorman (Eds.), *Creativity and innovation in the reign of Hatshepsut. Studies in ancient oriental civilization 69* (pp. 49–92). Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Lacau, P. & Chevrier, H. (1979). Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak II. Le Caire: Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.

Lansing, A., & Hayes, W. C. (1937). The Museum's excavations at Thebes. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, 32*(1 (2)), 4–39.

Laporta, V. (2012). Legitimation and ontological changes in the royal figure of queen Hatshepsut (c. 1479–1458). In H. A. el Gawa, H. Andres, M. Correas-Amador et al. (Eds.), *Current research in Egyptology 2011, Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Symposium Durham University 2011* (pp. 117–126). Oxford and Oakwille: Oxbow Books.

Latour, B. (1993). We have never been modern. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social, An introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leblanc, C. (1980). Piliers et colosses de type «Osiriaque» dans le context des temples de culte royal. *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 80*, 69–89.

Manniche, L. (1977). Some aspects of ancient Egyptian sexual life. *Acta Orientalia, 38*, 11–23.

Manniche, L. (1987). *Sexual Life in Ancient Egypt*. London and New York: KPI.

Matić, U. (2012a). To queer or not to queer? That is the question: sex/gender, prestige and burial no. 10 on the Mokrin necropolis. Dacia-Recherches et découvertes archéologiques en Roumanie LVI: 169–185.

Matić, U. (2012b). Out of the word and out of the picture? Keftiu and materializations of 'Minoans'. In I.-M. B. Danielsson, F. Fahlander, & Y. Sjöstrand (Eds.), *Encountering imagery: Materialities, perceptions, relations* (pp. 235–253). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Matić, U. (2014). Headhunting on the Roman frontier: (dis)respect, mockery, magic and the head of Augustus from Meroe. In M. Janković, V. D. Mihajlović, & S. Babić (Eds.), *The edges of the roman world* (pp. 117–134). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Matić, U. (forthcoming). „Her striking but cold beauty": gender and violence in depictions of queen Nefertiti smiting the enemies. In U. Matić & B. Jensen (Eds.), *Archaeologies of gender and violence*.

McCarthy, H. L. (2008). Rules of decorum and expressions of gender fluidity in Tawosret's tomb. In C. Graves-Brown (Ed.), *Sex and gender in ancient Egypt. 'don your wig for a joyful hour'* (pp. 83–113). Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Meskell, L. (1999). *Archaeologies of social life: age, sex, class et cetera in ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Meskell, L. (2004). *Object worlds in ancient Egypt: material biographies past and present*. Oxford: Berg.

Morenz, L. (2014). *Kleine Archäologie des ägyptischen Humors. Ein kulturgeschictlicher Testschnitt*. Bonner Ägyptologische Beiträge 3. Berlin: Eb Verlag.

Morenz, L. D., & Popko, L. (2010). The second intermediate period and the new kingdom. In A. B. Lloyd (Ed.), *A companion to ancient Egypt* (pp. 101–119). Oxford: Willey-Blackwell.

Müller-Wollermann, R. (2004). *Vergehen und Strafen*. Zur Sanktionierung Abweichenden Verhaltens im Alten Ägypten. Probleme der Ägyptologie 21. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Naville, E. (1897). *The Temple of Deir el Bahari. Part II. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Society 14*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Naville, E. (1901). *The Temple of Deir el Bahari. Part IV. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Society 19*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Naville, E. (1906). *The Temple of Deir el Bahari. Part V. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Society 27*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Naville, E. (1908). *The Temple of Deir el Bahari. Part V. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Society 29*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Pawlicki, F. (1997). Polnische Arbeiten im Tempel der Königin Hatschepsut in Deir el-Bahari. In I. Wolniak (Hrsg.), *Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Ausstellung der Kunstschätze aus den Sammlungen: der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, des Ägyptischen Museums und der Papyrussammlung, des Kestner Museums, Hannover, der Staatlichen Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, München, des Nationalmuseums in Warschau* (pp. 45–56). Warschau: National museum in Warschau.

Pawlicki, F. (2007). Princess Neferure in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir-el Bahari. Études et Travaux XXI, 110–127.

Price, C. (2011). Ramesses, 'king of kings': on the context and interpretation of royal colossi. In M. Collier & S. Snape (Eds.), *Ramesside studies in honour of K. A. Kicthen* (pp. 403–411). Bolton: Rutherford Press.

Prine, E. (2000). Searching for third genders: towards a prehistory of domestic space in middle Missouri villages. In B. L. Voss & R. A. Schmidt (Eds.), *Archaeologies of sexuality* (pp. 197–219). London & New York: Routledge.

Ramet, S. P. (1996). Gender reversals and gender cultures. An introduction. In S. P. Ramet (Ed.), *Gender reversals and gender cultures, Anthropological and historical perspectives* (pp. 1–21). London and New York: Routledge.

Ratié, S. (1979). La reine Hatchepsout. Sources et problemès. Orientalia Monspeliensia I. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Robins, G. (1993). *Women in ancient Egypt*. London: British Museum.

Robins, G. (1994). Some principles of compositional dominance and gender hierarchy in Egyptian art. *The Journal of American Research Center in Egypt, XXXI*, 33–40.

Robins, G. (1999). The names of Hatshepsut as king. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 85*, 103–112.

Robins, G. (2001). *Egyptian statues*. Princes Risborough: Shire Publications.

Robins, G. (2005). Cult statues in ancient Egypt. In N. H. Walls (Ed.), *Cult image and divine representation in the ancient near east* (pp. 1–12). Boston: American School of Oriental Research.

Romer, J. (1982). *People of the Nile*. London: The Rainbird Publishing Group.

Roth, A. M. (2005). Models of authority: Hatshepsut's predecessors in power. In C. H. Roehrig (Ed.), *Hatshepsut from queen to pharaoh* (pp. 9–15). New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Rubin, G. (1997). The traffic in women: notes on the "political economy" of sex. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The second wave: a reader in feminist theory* (pp. 27–62). New York and London: Routledge.

Sankiewitz, M. (2011). The 'co-regency' of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III in the light of iconography in the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. In M. Horn, J. Kramer, D. Soliman et al. (Eds.), *Current research in Egyptology 2010: proceedings of the eleventh annual symposium* (pp. 131–144). Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Schmidt, R. A. (2002). The iceman cometh: queering the archaeological past. In E. Lewin & W. L. Leap (Eds.), *Out in theory: the emergence of lesbian and gay anthropology* (pp. 155–185). Illinois: The University of Illinois Press.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Schukraft, B. (2007). Homosexualität im alten Ägypten. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, 36*, 297–331.
Schulz, R. (2015). Hatschepsut: von der Gottesgemahlin zum Pharao. In M. Eldamaty, F. Hoffmann und M. Minas-Nerpel (Hrsg.), *Ägyptische Königinnen vom Neuen Reich bis in die islamische Zeit.* Beiträge zur Konferenz in der Kulturabteilung der Botschaft der Arabischen Republik Ägypten in Berlin am 19.01.2013 (pp. 7–24). Vaterstetten: Verlag Patrick Brose.
Shackell-Smith, Aaron. (2012). The inscriptions of Hatshepsut at the temple of Semnah: An art-historical and epigraphic re-appraisal. In C. M. Knoblauch & J. C. Gill (Eds.), *Egyptology in Australia and New Zealand 2009*. Proceedings of the Conference held in Melbourne, September 4th–6th.. BAR International Series 2355 (pp. 133–144). Oxford: Archaeopress.
Shalomi-Hen, R. (2008). The bearded woman and the queen: the formation and transformation of female divine classifiers. In C. Graves-Brown (Ed.), *Sex and gender in ancient Egypt. 'Don your wig for a joyful hour'* (pp. 179–190). Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
Silverman, D. P. (1995). The nature of Egyptian kingship. In D. O'Connor & D. P. Silverman (Eds.), *Ancient Egyptian kingship* (pp. 49–94). Leiden: Brill.
Silverman, D. P. (2001). Humor and satire. In D. B. Redford (Ed.), *The Oxford encyclopedia of ancient Egypt, volume 2* (pp. 127–130). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sofaer, J. R. (2006). *The body as material culture, A Theoretical Osteoarchaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sørensen, M. L. S. (2000). *Gender archaeology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Stephan, K. (2008). *Die Dekoration der "Chapelle Rouge" in Karnak. Struktur und Funktion.* Norderstedt: Books on Demand.
Sweeney, D. (2011). Sex and gender. In E. Frood & W. Wendrich (Eds.), *UCLA encyclopedia of Egyptology* (pp. 1–12). Los Angeles: University of California.
Szafrański, Z. E. (2007). King (?) Neferure, Daughter of Kings Tuthmosis II and Hatshepsut. Études et Travaux XXI, 140–150.
Szpakowska, K. (2012). Hidden voices: unveiling women in ancient Egypt. In S. L. James & S. Dillon (Eds.), *A companion to women in the ancient world* (pp. 25–37). Oxford: Willey-Blackwell.
Tefnin, R. (1979). La statuaire d'Hatshepsout. Portrait royal et politique sous la 18e Dynastie. Monumenta Aegyptiaca IV. Bruxelles: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
Traub, V. (2008). The past is a foreign country? The times and spaces of Islamicate sexuality studies. In K. Babayan & A. Najmabadi (Eds.), *Islamicate sexualities. Translations across temporal geographies of desire. Harvard Middle Eastern monographs XXXIX* (pp. 1–40). London: Harvard University Press.
Tyldesley, J. A. (1995). *Daughters of Isis: women in ancient Egypt.* London: Penguin Books.
Varela, M. M. C., Dhawan, N., & Engel, A. (2011). Introduction. Hegemony and heteronormativity: revisiting 'the political' in queer politics. In A. Engel, M. M. C. Varela, & N. Dhawan (Eds.), *Hegemony and heteronormativity: revisiting 'the political' in queer politics* (pp. 1–24). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
Verbovsek, A. (2006). Die sogennanten Hyksosmonumente. Eine archäologische Standortbestimmung. Göttinger Orientforsuegen IV. Reihe Ägyptologie 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
Wadiwel, D. (2009). Sex and lubricative ethic. In N. Giffney & M. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to queer theory* (pp. 491–506). Surrey: Ashgate.
Watterson, B. (2012). *Women in Ancient Egypt.* Amberley: Palgrave Macmilan.
Wente, E. F. (1984). Some graffiti from the reign of Hatshepsut. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 43*(4), 47–54.
Wilkinson, T. (2011). *The rise and fall of ancient Egypt.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
Большаков, В. А. (2009). Воцарение Хатшепсут. Новая Версия. Восток/Orient 1: 14–21.

This content downloaded from
97.151.184.20 on Thu, 28 May 2026 00:01:04 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms